

5431

**AL-MG ISOTOPE SYSTEMATICS IN THE EFREMOVKA E60 CAI: EVIDENCE OF RE-EQUILIBRATION**

M. Wadhwa<sup>1</sup>, P. E. Janney, and A. N. Krot<sup>2</sup>. <sup>1</sup>School of Earth and Space Exploration, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA. E-mail: wadhwa@asu.edu. <sup>2</sup>HIGP/SOEST, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA.

**Introduction:** In recent years, the calcium-aluminum-rich inclusion (CAI) E60 from the Efremovka reduced CV3 chondrite has been used as an age anchor for the Al-Mg extinct chronometer ( $t_{1/2} \sim 0.73$  Ma) since an internal Al-Mg isochron corresponding to a  $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al}$  ratio of  $(4.63 \pm 0.44) \times 10^{-5}$  has been determined for it [1] and a highly precise  $^{207}\text{Pb}$ - $^{206}\text{Pb}$  age of  $4567.11 \pm 0.16$  Ma has also been reported [2]. However, recent investigations have noted discrepancies between  $^{207}\text{Pb}$ - $^{206}\text{Pb}$  ages and  $^{26}\text{Al}$ - $^{26}\text{Mg}$  systematics in several meteoritic materials. For example, Al-Mg systematics in the angrites D'Orbigny and Sahara 99555 anchored to the E60 CAI yield ages that are  $\sim 2$  Ma younger than the Pb-Pb ages for these achondrites ([3] and references therein). Therefore, with the goal of assessing the suitability of the E60 CAI as a time anchor for the  $^{26}\text{Al}$ - $^{26}\text{Mg}$  system, we initiated a high-precision laser ablation multicollector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometer (LA-MC-ICPMS) study of internal  $^{26}\text{Al}$ - $^{26}\text{Mg}$  isotope systematics in this inclusion. We have previously presented some preliminary results from this investigation [4]. Here, we report the results of further analyses that demonstrate evidence for re-equilibration of the Al-Mg system in E60.

**Analytical:** A polished thick slice of the Efremovka E60 CAI was studied at UH using a Cameca SX-50 electron microprobe and a JEOL JSM-5900LV SEM equipped with a Thermo Electron energy dispersive spectrometer. Magnesium isotopes were measured with a Thermo-Finnigan Neptune MC-ICPMS instrument and a Photon Machines fast excimer laser ablation system (producing 193 nm wavelength and 4 ns pulse length) at ASU using methods similar to those described earlier [4].

**Results and Discussion:** Previously we reported analyses of a diopside-rich rim (1 spot), diopside in the interior (2 spots), melilites in the rim and in the interior (3 spots each), and anorthites in the rim (3 spots) of the E60 CAI [4]. Since anorthites in E60 are typically fine-grained and we used beam spots up to  $\sim 90$   $\mu\text{m}$ , we were unable to get clean analyses of this phase, and the highest  $^{27}\text{Al}/^{24}\text{Mg}$  ratios reported in [4] were only up to  $\sim 16$ . The majority of these preliminary data defined a slope corresponding to a  $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al}$  ratio of  $(2.9 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-5}$  and an initial  $^{26}\text{Mg}/^{24}\text{Mg}$  ratio of  $0.23 \pm 0.09$  ‰ (MSWD = 0.9); the exceptions were the melilite rim analyses which fell above this isochron. We have now made additional analyses of interior diopside (2 spots), melilites in the rim and the interior (2 spots each) and anorthites in the rim (4 spots). We used beam spot sizes of  $\sim 30$ – $40$   $\mu\text{m}$ , and were able to obtain  $^{27}\text{Al}/^{24}\text{Mg}$  ratios up to  $\sim 90$  for the anorthites. With the exception of the 3 previous melilite rim analyses, all the data taken together define an Al-Mg isochron with a slope corresponding to a  $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al}$  ratio of  $(3.20 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-5}$  and an initial  $^{26}\text{Mg}/^{24}\text{Mg}$  ratio of  $0.19 \pm 0.08$  ‰ (MSWD = 1.5). Assuming a canonical initial solar system  $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al} \sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$ , these data indicate that the Al-Mg system in E60 was re-equilibrated  $\sim 0.5$  Ma after the beginning of the solar system.

**References:** [1] Amelin Y. et al. 2002. *Science* 297:1678–1683. [2] Amelin Y. et al. 2006. Abstract #1970, 37<sup>th</sup> LPSC. [3] Spivak-Birndorf L. et al. 2009. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, in press. [4] Wadhwa M. et al. 2009. Abstract #2495, 40<sup>th</sup> LPSC.

5438

**CHROMIUM FLUENCE MEASUREMENTS IN GENESIS SAMPLES USING A NANOSIMS**

J. Wang, L. R. Nittler<sup>1</sup>, M. Humayun<sup>2</sup> and D. S. Burnett<sup>3</sup>. <sup>1</sup>Dept. Of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington. E-mail: jwang@ciw.edu. <sup>2</sup>Florida State University, <sup>3</sup>Caltech.

**Introduction:** Our Sun holds most of the mass of the solar system (99.9%) and its chemical and isotopic composition thus provides the reference standard for astronomical, cosmochemical and geochemical studies. The Genesis mission returned solar wind implanted samples for studying solar wind composition. Previous studies of solar wind Cr fluence in Genesis samples showed over-estimates of it due to surface contamination [1–2]. We analyzed three different Si target samples (60040, 30877 and 60490) by NanoSIMS. With smaller analysis area ( $10$ – $15$   $\mu\text{m}^2$  in a  $30$   $\mu\text{m}^2$  rastered area) and meticulous cleaning procedures (sample 60490) [3], the surface contamination of Cr can be avoided. We obtained an average Cr fluence value  $3.3 \pm 1.1 \times 10^{10}$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$  ( $2\sigma$ ).

**Analytical Methods:** We measured positive secondary ions of  $^{24}\text{Mg}$ ,  $^{25}\text{Mg}$ ,  $^{26}\text{Mg}$ ,  $^{30}\text{Si}$ ,  $^{52}\text{Cr}$ ,  $^{56}\text{Fe}$  and  $^{57}\text{Fe}$  simultaneously using a Cameca NanoSIMS 50L ion microprobe at Carnegie Institution of Washington. The  $16$  keV  $\text{O}^-$  primary beam was rastered over  $30$   $\mu\text{m}^2$  areas, with signal collection only from the central  $10$  and  $15$   $\mu\text{m}^2$  region to avoid crater edge effects. The primary beam intensity was around  $200$  pA with a size of  $2$ – $3$   $\mu\text{m}$ . Each analysis took a little over one hour with  $250$  measurement cycles. Ratios of  $^{52}\text{Cr}/^{30}\text{Si}$  were averaged in every  $5$  cycles and summed and the beginning  $8$  minutes of transient period were not included in the final data. This result was compared with the average results of  $3$  analyses of a  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  implant standard ( $3 \times 10^{13}$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$ ) to obtain the solar wind implanted  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  fluence. Three different Genesis samples (60040, 30877, and 60490) were measured with a total of  $20$  analyses. Sample 60490 was carefully cleaned with the hot aqua regia cleaning procedure at the Florida State University [3].

**Results:** The photospheric Cr/Mg ratio is  $0.0126$  [4]. Thus, taking the Genesis Mg fluence to be  $2.15 \times 10^{12}$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$  [5] and considering the terrestrial isotopic abundance of  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  ( $83.8\%$  of total Cr) gives an expected fluence for  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  of  $2.3 \times 10^{10}$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$ . We obtain average  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  fluences for 60040, 30877, and 60490 of  $7.3$ ,  $2.8$  and  $1.3 \times 10^{10}$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$ . The average fluence of  $3.3 \times 10^{10} \pm 1.1$  atom/ $\text{cm}^2$  is in good agreement with the expected fluence and with a previous SIMS measurement [6]. Since, in order to avoid transient sputtering effects, we did not include the beginning  $8$  minutes of data, we might have under-determined the  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  solar fluence especially in the extremely cleaned sample 60490. The somewhat higher value for 60040 is mostly surface contamination. Clearly, obtaining more accurate analyses of the  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  fluence requires not only careful cleaning of the sample surface, but also understanding, reduction of the transient effects at the beginning of the data collection and accurate  $^{52}\text{Cr}$  implant standards. Mg and Fe isotopic data will be presented at the conference.

**References:** [1] Wang J. et al. 2007. 70<sup>th</sup> Meteoritical Society Meeting abstract. [2] Vervovkin I. V. et al. 2009. 40<sup>th</sup> LPSC. pp. 2422–2423. [3] Huang S. et al. 39<sup>th</sup> LPSC. pp. 1976–1977. [4] Lodders K. 2003. *The Astrophysical Journal* 591:1120–1247. [5] Jurewicz A. J. G. et al. 2008. 39<sup>th</sup> LPSC. pp. 2272–2273. [6] Burnett D. S. et al. 2007. 38<sup>th</sup> LPSC. pp. 1843–1844.